



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,961	11/03/2005	Andrew Gordon Williams	901096542 (02-0073)	7456
22342 7590 04/23/2010 FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LASALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406				
EXAMINER BATISTA, MARCOS				
ART UNIT 2617		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/23/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/529,961

**Applicant(s)**

WILLIAMS, ANDREW GORDON

**Examiner**

MARCOS BATISTA

**Art Unit**

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/200)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Action is in response to Applicant's Appeal Brief filed on 02/09/2010. Claims 1-74 are still pending in the present application. This Action is made **NON-FINAL**.

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 02/09/2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The new status of the claims and a response to Applicant's arguments are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the

conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 40, claims the non-statutory subject matter of a computer program element which is nothing more than a data structure. Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1754 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Therefore, since the claimed programs are not tangibly embodied in a physical medium and encoded on a computer-readable medium then the Applicants has not complied with 35 U.S.C 101. The Examiner suggests amending claim 40 to include something like “a data carrier having stored therein program code” as described in the disclosure of the instant application at page 19 lines 5-11 in order to overcome the 101 rejection.

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word applicationspecific at the beginning of line 7 appears to be missing a dash between application and specific (application-specific). Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed in the Appeal Brief on 02/09/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After carefully revising the Office Action pertinent to the present response and remarks, the following main point(s) have been identified:

1) The Applicant states that Suumaki does not disclose "means for activating, in response to the means for detecting the requested application-specific packets, a plurality of packet sessions with application-specific QoS parameters, without requiring explicit cooperation of application software. The Applicant also states that the reason why Suumaki does not disclose the above features is because Suumaki clearly discloses, in each and every one of his general and specific examples, that activation of an application connection requires the explicit cooperation of the corresponding connection with the QMOC (See pages 10 and 11 of the Appeal Brief).

Regarding point 1), Suumaki at column 7 lines 37-43 discloses that the (QoS Management & Optimization Control) QMOC has the task of controlling the activation connection and data flows of each application. The socket application programming interface (SAPI) informs the QMOC of any particular application wishing to establish a connection with another application or service. The SAPI transfers information to the QMOC for certain applications so that the QMOC can take the full control of activating the corresponding PDP. This does not necessarily mean that the QMOC needs the cooperation of the SAPI in order to carry out the activation task. The QMOC is fully in

charge in controlling the activation of the application without explicit assistance from the SAPI. A closer look to Suumaki at col. 11 line 51 – col. 12 line 2 suggests that the QMOC can activate a particular PDP for a particular application even when information is not transmitted from the SAPI to the QMOC (i.e., without interaction with the SAPI). This is because the QMOC can consult the internal database for the required information. It can also be seen at col. 11 line 51 – col. 12 line 2, that the activation of the PDP is in response to detecting a traffic class (i.e., application-specific packet).

Suumaki, column 7 lines 37-43:

3) FIG. 3a also shows the control block QMOC (QoS Management & Optimization Control). The tasks of this control block QMOC include controlling the activation of application connections and data flows of each application and the allocation of the resources required. In addition, the control block QMOC performs the changes required by the altered needs of the quality of service.

Suumaki, col. 11 line 51 – col. 12 line 2:

“When the E-mail application (application H) is started, the **socket application programming interface does not transmit quality of service information**, but for this application, quality of service information has been saved in the

internal database. **From this information, the control block QMOC detects that the fourth traffic class has been specified for this application.** The PDP context corresponding to the fourth traffic class is the ninth PDP context PDP9, and thus the control block QMOC selects this PDP context for use by this application H. In addition, the control block QMOC specifies a data transfer filter for the application. This data transfer filter is, for instance, a database in which information such as the identifier used in the data flow packets, the PDP context, quality of service parameters or other information is saved. **After this, the control block QMOC activates the selected PDP context PDP9 and sends the data from the data transfer filter to the packet classifier block PAC of the mobile terminal MT and the packet-switched network, preferably to the gateway GPRS support node 3G-GGSN, which is the second end of the data transfer connection"**

Therefore, the argued features are written such that they read upon the cited reference(s).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-10, 13-16, 18-28, 31-34, 36-40, and 43-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Suumaki et al. (US 6847610 B1), hereafter

"Suumaki," in view of Jungck et al. (US 20060029104 A1), hereafter "Jungck."

Consider claim 1, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses an apparatus for session control in a wireless communication network, comprising: means for detecting requested application-specific packets in a packet stream (**see fig. 5, col. 8 lines 42-48, col. 11 lines 55-60**); and means for activating, in response to the means for detecting requested application-specific packets, a plurality of packet sessions with application-specific QoS parameters, without requiring explicit cooperation of application software (**see col. 7 lines 38-41, col. 11 lines 65-67, col. 12 lines 1-2, and 46-49 - the QMOC does the QoS parameters detection independently of any type of application**).

Suumaki, however, does not particular refer to means for blocking- application-specific packets in the packet stream that are not the requested application-specific



packets. Jungck, in the same field of endeavor, teaches means for blocking- application-specific packets in the packet stream that are not the requested application-specific packets (**see pars. 0175 lines 1-15, 0176 lines 6-16**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Suumaki and have it include means for blocking- application-specific packets in the packet stream that are not the requested application-specific packets, as taught by Jungck. The motivation would have been in order to *enhance Internet infrastructure to more efficiently deliver content from providers to users and provide additional network throughput, reliability, security and fault tolerance* (**see par. 0006 lines 1-4**).

Consider claim 2, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches further comprising means for deactivating at least one of the plurality of packet sessions (see col. 14 lines 56-58).

Consider claim 3, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the wireless communication network comprises a UMTS radio access network (see col. 3 lines 31-35).

Consider claim 4, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise Packet Data Protocol (PDP) contexts (see col. 3 lines 41-46).

Consider claim 5, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting comprises stateful inspection means, and the apparatus further comprises session manager

means and packet filter means responsive to the stateful inspection means (see col. 8 lines 42-48 – packet are routed based in part to theirs respective connection).

Consider claim 6, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting is arranged to inspect uplink packet flows to detect application-specific packet flows, via application-specific control messages (see col. 8 lines 55-61).

Consider claim 7, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting is arranged to inspect downlink packet flows to detect application-specific packet flows, via application-specific control messages (see col. 10 lines 26-35).

Consider claim 8, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise conversational class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 5 lines 5-7).

Consider claim 9, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 8 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the conversational class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Voice over IP (VoIP) traffic (see col. 3 lines 41-46, col. 12 lines 43-46).

Consider claim 10, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 8 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the conversational class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Video over IP traffic (see col. 3 lines 41-46, col. 12 lines 43-46).

Consider claim 13, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise streaming

class PDP contexts (see col. 7 lines 13-19).

Consider claim 14, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 13 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the streaming class PDP contexts are arranged to carry streaming media traffic controlled by Real Time Streaming Protocol (see col. 7 lines 13-19).

Consider claim 15, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise interactive class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 4 lines 65-67, col. 5 line 1).

Consider claim 16, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise background class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 4 lines 65-67, col. 5 line 1).

Consider claim 18, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 16 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the background class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) traffic (see fig. 3a, col. 7 lines 13-19).

Consider claims 19-28, 31-34 and 36, these are method claims corresponding to system claims 1-10, 13-15, and 18. Therefore, they have been analyzed and rejected based upon the system claims 1-10, 13-16, and 18 respectively.

Consider claim 37, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 19 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the method is performed in User equipment (UE) (see fig. col. 8 lines 55-64).

Consider claim 38, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of

claim 1 above, Suumaki also teaches User equipment (UE) for use in a UTRA system, the user equipment comprising the apparatus of claims 1 (see fig. 4a, col. 1 lines 65-67, col. 2 lines 1-6).

Consider claim 39, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claim 19 above, Suumaki also teaches an integrated circuit comprising the apparatus of claim 1 (see col. 7 lines 51-54).

Consider claim 40, this claim discusses the same subject matter as claim 19. Therefore, it has been analyzed and rejected based upon the rejection to claim 19.

Consider claims 43, 44 and 58, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 3 and 20 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise Packet Data Protocol (PDP) contexts (see col. 3 lines 41-46).

Consider claims 45, 46 and 47, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 3 and 4 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting comprises stateful inspection means, and the apparatus further comprises session manager means and packet filter means responsive to the stateful inspection means (see col. 8 lines 42-48 – packet are routed based in part to their respective connection).

Consider claims 48 and 59, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 5 and 23 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting is arranged to inspect uplink packet flows to detect application-specific packet flows, via application-specific control messages (see col. 8 lines 55-61).

Consider claims 49 and 60, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the

invention of claims 5 and 23 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the means for detecting is arranged to inspect downlink packet flows to detect application-specific packet flows, via application-specific control messages (see col. 10 lines 26-35).

Consider claims 50, 51, 61 and 62, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 4, 20 and 22 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise conversational class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 5 lines 5-7).

Consider claims 52, 53, 63 and 64, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 4, 20 and 22 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise streaming class PDP contexts (see col. 7 lines 13-19).

Consider claims 54, 55, 65 and 66, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 4, 20 and 22 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise interactive class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 4 lines 65-67, col. 5 line 1).

Consider claims 56, 57, 67 and 68, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 2, 4, 20 and 22 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the packet sessions comprise background class PDP contexts (see tab. 1, col. 4 lines 65-67, col. 5 line 1).

Consider claims 69-74, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses the invention of claims 21-25 above, Suumaki also teaches wherein the method is performed in User equipment (UE) (see fig 3b, col. 8 lines 55-64).

9. Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Suumaki et al. (US 6847610 B1), hereafter "Suumaki," in view of Jungck et al. (US 20060029104 A1), hereafter "Jungck," further in view of Dorenbosch et al. (US 20030235184 A1), hereafter "Dorenbosch."

Consider claim 11, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses claims 1 and 9 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the traffic is based on originated calls controlled by Session Initiation Protocol (SIP).

Dorenbosch, in analogous art, teaches wherein the traffic is based on originated calls controlled by Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (see par. 0055 lines 7-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Suumaki as modified by Jungck and have it include wherein the traffic is based on originated calls controlled by Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), as taught by Dorenbosch. The motivation would have been in order to provide a mean for connection setup and session control (see par. 0055 lines 7-11).

Consider claim 29, this is method claim corresponding to system claims 11. Therefore, it has been analyzed and rejected based upon the system claim 11 above.

10. Claims 12, 17, 30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suumaki et al. (US 6847610 B1), hereafter "Suumaki," in view of Jungck et al. (US 20060029104 A1), hereafter "Jungck," further in view of Fenton et al. (US 20030193967 A1), hereafter "Fenton."

Consider claim 12, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses claims 1 and 9 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the traffic is based on originated calls

controlled by H.323 protocol.

Fenton, in analogous art, teaches wherein the traffic is based on originated calls controlled by H.323 protocol (see par. 0049 lines 11-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Suumaki as modified by Jungck and have it include wherein the traffic is based on originated calls controlled by H.323 protocol, as taught by Fenton. The motivation would have been in order to provide access to information via an open standard protocol (see par. 0049 lines 11-14).

Consider claim 17, Suumaki discloses as modified by Jungck claims 1 and 16 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the background class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Post Office Protocol - Version 3 (POP3) traffic.

Fenton, in analogous art, teaches to wherein the background class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Post Office Protocol - Version 3 (POP3) traffic (see par. 0049 lines 11-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Suumaki as modified by Jungck and have it include wherein the background class PDP contexts are arranged to carry Post Office Protocol - Version 3 (POP3) traffic, as taught by Fenton. The motivation would have been in order to provide access to information via an open standard protocol (see par. 0049 lines 11-14).

Consider claims 30 and 35, these are method claims corresponding to system claims 12 and 17. Therefore, they have been analyzed and rejected based upon the

system claims 12 and 17 respectively.

11. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suumaki et al. (US 6847610 B1), hereafter "Suumaki," in view of Jungck et al. (US 20060029104 A1), hereafter "Jungck," further in view of Boyle et al. (US 20050235349 A1), hereafter "Boyle."

Consider claims 41 and 42, Suumaki as modified by Jungck discloses claims 5 and 23 above, but does not particular refer to wherein detecting in a stateful inspector comprises inspecting packets, implying a state of an application-specific packet session via control packets and allowing packets for said session to flow through the firewall if said session originated from inside the firewall or otherwise, blocking said session otherwise.

Boyle, in the same field of endeavor, teaches wherein detecting in a stateful inspector comprises inspecting packets, implying a state of an application-specific packet session via control packets and allowing packets for said session to flow through the firewall if said session originated from inside the firewall or otherwise, blocking said session otherwise (see pars. 0009 lines 1-6, 0052 lines 1-3, 0059 lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Suumaki as modified by Jungck and have it include wherein detecting in a stateful inspector comprises inspecting packets, implying a state of an application-specific packet session via control packets and allowing packets for said session to flow through the firewall if said session originated



from inside the firewall or otherwise, blocking said session otherwise, as taught by Boyle. The motivation would have been in order to prevent unsolicited network traffic from entering a private network (see par. 0009 lines 1-6).

### ***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marcos Batista, whose telephone number is (571) 270-5209. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez can be reached at (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Application/Control Number: 10/529,961

Page 17

Art Unit: 2617

*/Marcos Batista/*  
Examiner

*/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/*  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

04/21/2010